

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of RODERICK GREEN, JR.,
MARAJAH AMERSON, and RAYMOND
WHITE, JR., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DELOIS AMERSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

RAYMOND LEWIS WHITE,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

July 7, 2005

No. 257058

Genesee Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 03-116815

Before: Cooper, P.J., and Fort Hood and R. S. Gribbs*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant Delois Amerson appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child Roderick Green, Jr., under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j).¹ We affirm.

We review a trial court's decision to terminate parental rights for clear error.² If the trial court determines that the petitioner has proven by clear and convincing evidence the existence of

¹ Although the trial court failed to specify the statutory basis for termination on the record, a careful reading of the record indicates that the court relied on MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j) as the statutory bases for termination. Cf. *In re Toler*, 193 Mich App 474, 476; 484 NW2d 672 (1992).

² MCR 3.997(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989).

* Former Court of Appeals judge, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment.

one or more statutory grounds for termination, the court must terminate the respondent's parental rights unless it finds from the record evidence that termination is clearly not in the child's best interests.³ We review the trial court's determination regarding the child's best interests for clear error.⁴

The trial court properly found that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. Respondent-appellant admitted that she had long history of substance abuse. In fact, her parental rights to her two younger children were also terminated, partly because they were born addicted to cocaine. However, respondent-appellant repeatedly failed to attend drug screens and failed to complete substance abuse treatment. Respondent-appellant's noncompliance continued even after her visitation rights were suspended as a result of her failure to attend drug screens. Furthermore, respondent-appellant failed to present any evidence that termination was contrary to the child's best interests.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jessica R. Cooper
/s/ Karen M. Fort Hood
/s/ Roman S. Gribbs

³ MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 353-354; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

⁴ *Id.* at 356-357.